

Yw



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,211	10/19/2001	Kazuhiro Satoh	2271/66118	6244

7590 04/07/2005

RICHARD F. JAWORSKI
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

MENBERU, BENIYAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,211

Applicant(s)

SATOH, KAZUHIRO

Examiner

Beniyam Menberu

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/19/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 23, lines 3-15, the "no" branch in step s109 of figure 13 is not described in the specification.

On page 25, lines 12-24, the "no" branch in step s211 of figure 14 is not described in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because:

Figure 13, step s106, the term "READGIN" should be "READING".

Figure 14, step s208, the term "READGIN" should be "READING".

Figure 16, step s404, the term "READGIN" should be "READING".

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes

made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5680158 to Yoshida et al.

Regarding claim 1, Yoshida et al disclose a communication device comprising: a keyboard used to input literal information (column 9, lines 23-26; lines 38-40; Figure 1, reference 50), wherein a character allocated to each of keys provided on said keyboard can be changed (column 11, lines 4-17).

Regarding claim 2, Yoshida et al teach all the limitations of claim 1. Further Yoshida et al disclose the communication device as claimed in claim 1, wherein the

character is associated to each of said keys according to a predetermined keyboard character layout (column 11, lines 14-17).

Regarding claim 3, Yoshida et al teach all the limitations of claim 2. Further Yoshida et al disclose the communication device as claimed in claim 2, wherein said predetermined keyboard character layout is selected from among a plurality of predetermined keyboard character layouts by a user (column 11, lines 14-17).

5. Claims 7, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5253940 to Abecassis.

Regarding claim 7, Abecassis discloses a communication device (Abecassis discloses a computer but a computer can be used as a communication device (column 1, lines 64-68).) comprising: a numeric keypad (Figure 1) used to input numeric information, wherein a character allocated to each of keys provided on said numeric keypad can be changed (column 5, lines 20-30, lines 37-42).

Regarding claim 8, Abecassis teaches all the limitations of claim 7. Further Abecassis discloses the communication device as claimed in claim 7, wherein the character is allocated to each of said keys according to a predetermined numeric-keypad character layout (column 5, lines 20-24; Figure 6,7).

Regarding claim 9, Abecassis teaches all the limitations of claim 8. Further the communication device as claimed in claim 8, wherein said predetermined numeric-keypad character layout is selected from among a plurality of predetermined numeric-keypad character layouts by a user (column 5, lines 34-42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5680158 to Yoshida et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. US 2002/0174231 A1 to Surloff et al.

Regarding claim 4, Yoshida et al teaches all the limitations of claim 3. However Yoshida et al does not disclose the communication device as claimed in claim 3, wherein configuration information regarding a configuration of the communication device is obtained so that said predetermined keyboard character layout is selected according to said configuration information.

Surloff et al disclose the communication device (page 1, paragraph 18) as claimed in claim 3, wherein configuration information regarding a configuration of the communication device is obtained so that said predetermined keyboard character layout is selected according to said configuration information (page 7, paragraph 74).

Yoshida et al and Surloff et al are combinable because they are in the similar problem area of communication device with keyboard input.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the keyboard layout selection of Surloff et al with the

communication device of Yoshida et al to implement configuration depending keyboard layout.

The motivation to combine the reference is clear because Surloff et al teaches that Internet access can be simplified with the configurable keyboard (page 7, paragraph 74, lines 1-7).

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5680158 to Yoshida et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5523754 to Eisen et al.

Regarding claim 5, Yoshida et al teaches all the limitations of claim 3. However Yoshida et al does not disclose the communication device as claimed in claim 3, wherein situation information regarding a nation where the communication device is situated is obtained so that said predetermined keyboard character layout is selected according to said situation information.

Eisen et al discloses the communication device (column 2, lines 45-55) wherein situation information regarding a nation where the communication device is situated is obtained so that said predetermined keyboard character layout is selected according to said situation information (column 4, lines 9-20).

Yoshida et al and Eisen et al are combinable because they are in the similar problem area of communication device with keyboard input.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the keyboard configuration of Eisen et al with the system of Yoshida et al to implement keyboard configuration with respect to the nation where the communication device is located.

The motivation to combine the reference is clear because Eisen et al teaches that a multi-lingual keyboard is needed because of the different languages spoken in countries (column 1, lines 15-27).

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5680158 to Yoshida et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. US 2002/0174231 A1 to Surloff et al further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5523754 to Eisen et al.

Regarding claim 6, Yoshida et al teaches all the limitations of claim 3. However Yoshida et al does not disclose the communication device as claimed in claim 3, wherein configuration information regarding a configuration of the communication device is obtained, and situation information regarding a nation where the communication device is situated is obtained, so that said predetermined keyboard character layout is selected according to at least one of said configuration information and said situation information.

Surloff et al disclose communication device wherein configuration information regarding a configuration of the communication device is obtained (Figure 7, reference step 222; page 4, paragraph 45, lines 4-6; page 7, paragraph 74, lines 7-13).

Eisen et al disclose communication device wherein situation information regarding a nation where the communication device is situated is obtained, so that said predetermined keyboard character layout is selected according to at least one of said configuration information and said situation information (column 4, lines 9-20).

Yoshida et al, Surloff et al, and Eisen et al are combinable because they are in the similar problem area of communication device with keyboard input.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the keyboard configuration of Surloff et al and Eisen et al with the system of Yoshida et al to implement keyboard layout depending on the system configuration and nation where the communication device is situated.

The motivation to combine the reference is clear because Eisen et al teaches that a multi-lingual keyboard is needed because of the different languages spoken in countries (column 1, lines 15-27) and Surloff et al teaches that Internet access can be simplified with the configurable keyboard (page 7, paragraph 74, lines 1-7).

Other Prior Art Cited

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 4844637 to Buisson et al disclose keyboard with variable configuration.

U.S. Patent No. 5847697 to Sugimoto disclose keyboard with plural characters per key.

U.S. Patent No. 6851877 to Liebhold disclose keyboard layout.

U.S. Patent No. 5953541 to King et al disclose keyboard with reduced keys.

U.S. Patent No. 6098086 to Krueger et al disclose processor for Japanese characters.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beniyam Menberu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7465. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600. The group receptionist number for TC 2600 is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2626

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov/>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner

Beniyam Menberu

BM

03/30/2005

Anh-Vinh Nguyen
Madeleine Anh-Vinh Nguyen
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2626